

Appl. No. 10/521,975
Amd. Dated July 23, 2007
Reply to Office Action Dated November 24, 2006

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Fig.2A; Fig.2B, Fig.2C and Fig.2D which have been renumbered into consecutive Arabic numerals. Therefore, these figures have been respectively renumbered as follow: Fig.2, Fig.3, Fig.4, Fig.5.

The attached sheets also include changes to Fig.3A and Fig.3B, which have been renumbered into consecutive Arabic numerals. Therefore, these figures have been respectively renumbered as follow: Fig.6, Fig.7.

In order to be consistent with these changes, the following figures have also been renumbered respectively as follows: Fig.4 and Fig.5 into Fig.8 and Fig.9.

Attachment: Replacement sheets
Annotated sheets showing changes

Appl. No. 10/521,975
Amd. Dated July 23, 2007
Reply to Office Action Dated November 24, 2006

Remarks/Arguments:

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 18 and 21-34 remain in this application. Claims 18,29 and 33 have been amended. Claim 19 and 20 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Additional amendments to the specification and drawings have been made. It is believed that no new matter has been added by way of any the amendments provided herein.

In first paragraph of the "*Drawings*" section of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that figures 2A, 2B, 2C and 2D have to be renumbered in consecutive Arabic numerals. The drawings have been respectively renumbered FIG.2, FIG.3, FIG.4 and FIG.5 and the relevant paragraphs of the Specification have been amended with changes made to the view numbers. It is believed that these amendments obviate the objection to the drawings.

In the second paragraph of the "*Drawings*" section of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that figures 3A and 3B have to be renumbered in consecutive Arabic numerals. The drawings have been respectively renumbered FIG.6 and FIG.7 and the relevant paragraphs of the Specification have been amended with changes made to the view numbers. It is believed that these amendments obviate the objection to the drawings.

Additionally, in order to reflect changes to numbering of the drawings as explained above, former figures 4 and 5 have been respectively renumbered 8 and 9. The relevant paragraphs of the Specification have been amended with changes made to the view numbers.

The attached sheets provide replacement sheets and annotated sheets showing changes.

Appl. No. 10/521,975
Amd. Dated July 23, 2007
Reply to Office Action Dated November 24, 2006

In the section entitled "Examiner Note", the Examiner indicated that the term INCONEL should be capitalized wherever it appears. Paragraph [0061] of the specification and claim 29 have been amended accordingly.

The Examiner rejected claims 18-30 under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant has amended claim 18 in order to include all limitations from claim 19 and withdraw the recitation "the lowest possible coefficient of friction".

The Examiner rejected claim 33 under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claim 33 in order to overcome that rejection. Particularly, Applicant has amended the terms "the step" in line 3 into the terms "the stop" as supported by specification paragraph [0078] and [0080], among others. Applicant has also amended the terms "the dog" in line 3 of claim 33 into the terms "a dog (37)" as supported by specification paragraph [0078].

The Examiner has rejected claims 18, 19, 21 and 24 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US3,598,456 to Love. Examiner has rejected claims 18, 21, 28 and 34 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2,316,021 to Rippingille in view of Love.

Examiner has objected claims 20, 22-27 and 30 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim and has allowed claims 31 and 32.

Appl. No. 10/521,975
Amd. Dated July 23, 2007
Reply to Office Action Dated November 24, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 14 2007


Applicant has amended claim 18 in order to include all limitations of former claims 18, 19 and 20. Applicant, therefore, submits that the objections against set of claims previously on filed are obviated. Corresponding former claims 19 and 20 have been cancelled.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Applicant believes this reply to be fully responsive to all outstanding issues and place this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action dated November 24, 2006 for which the three-month date for response was February 24, 2007. Since the Office Action dated November 24, 2006 was never received, no fees are believed to be due, however, please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-2183 (Reference Number 21.1087). A Petition for Revival of an Application Abandoned Unintentionally Under 37 CFR 1.137(b) is submitted herewith.

Date: July 27, 2007

Respectfully submitted,


Kevin McEnaney, Reg. No. 46,258
Schlumberger Technology Corporation
200 Gillingham Lane, MD 9
Sugar Land, TX 77478
Telephone: (281) 285-7325
Facsimile: (281) 285-5537

Attachments